

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STUART A. SCHEINMAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE COLEMAN COMPANY, INC.;  
DOES 1-10; and ROE CORPORATIONS  
1-10, inclusive

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:13-cv-00005-GMN-CWH

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Stuart A. Scheinman's Motion to Remand to State Court Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff argues that because his damages to date are approximately \$12,082.50, the amount in controversy requirement under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 is not satisfied and this Court lacks diversity jurisdiction to hear the matter. In its Response, Defendant The Coleman Company expresses that based on Plaintiff's representations, it does not oppose remand. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Remand to State Court Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447 is hereby **GRANTED**. The Clerk of the Court is directed to remand this action back to the Eighth Judicial District Court for the County of Clark, State of Nevada.

**DATED** this 4th day of June, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gloria M. Navarro  
United States District Judge